

REMARKS

With the above amendment, Claims 1-15 have been amended, and Claim 16 has been cancelled. The claim amendments not specifically discussed below are made for clarity and to improve grammer, and to put the claims in better form for U.S. prosecution. These amendments do not narrow the claims.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. Section 112 first paragraph. Claim 7 has been amended to recite “at least one additional seal” to separate the functions of the seal in Claim 3 from the seal in Claim 7. In the embodiment of Figure 8, the piston seal of Figure 3 is met by the seal 305, and the activating pin seal of Claim 7 is met by the seal 311.

The Examiner has also rejected Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. Section 101. Claim 16 is cancelled with this amendment.

The Examiner has also rejected Claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 13 as anticipated by Brummer or obvious over Brummer combined with Will. Independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the flow path is provided through the piston and at least a portion of the activating pin. In Brummer, the flow path travels outside of the piston housing. There is no teaching or suggestion in Brummer to provide a flow path through the piston or activating pin. Will does not cure this deficiency of Brummer as Will does not include an activating pin at all.

The remaining claims are dependent on Claim 1, and it is respectfully submitted that these claims are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections be re-considered, and the application passed to allowance.

Appl. No. : 10/635,433
Filed : August 7, 2003

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 2/14/07

By: 

Thomas R. Arno
Registration No. 40,490
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

3402106
020807